

Application Serial No. 10/720,970  
Attorney Docket No. 03-1018

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to provide serial numbers for the referenced applications and to improve form. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-16 and 18-22 have been amended to improve form and claims 3, 7 and 17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-16 and 18-22 are now pending in this application.

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Holloway et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0092451; hereinafter Holloway). The rejection is respectfully traversed, and Applicants request reconsideration in light of the following.<sup>1</sup>

Claim 1 is directed to a method for managing calls directed to a plurality of communications devices associated with a user. Claim 1, as amended, recites receiving user-defined preferences regarding handling of calls directed to the plurality of communications devices and storing the user-defined preferences. Holloway does not disclose or suggest these features.

For example, Holloway discloses that when mobile phone 230 comes within range of transmitter 220, mobile phone 230 may receive a signal from transmitter 220 and send an overhead message to cellular system 210 requesting that calls to mobile phone 230 be forwarded to preferred phone 240 (Holloway – paragraph 17). Holloway does not disclose receiving user-defined preferences regarding handling of calls directed to a plurality of communications devices and storing the user-defined preferences, as

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

Application Serial No. 10/720,970  
Attorney Docket No. 03-1018

recited in amended claim 1. In contrast, Holloway merely discloses transmitting an overhead message requesting call forwarding when mobile phone 230 is within range of transmitter 220.

Claim 1, as amended, also recites receiving an indication that a first one of the communications devices has moved within wireless communication range of a terminal. Claim 1, as amended, further recites forwarding calls intended for at least two of the communications devices to a second one of the communications devices in response to receipt of the indication and based on the user-defined preferences.

Holloway, as discussed above, discloses that calls for mobile phone 230 are forwarded to preferred phone 240 when mobile phone 230 comes within range of transmitter 220 (Holloway – paragraph 17). Holloway discloses similar processing with respect to preferred phone 540, which may be a phone installed in the user's automobile (Holloway – paragraph 19). That is, Holloway discloses that calls for mobile phone 230 may be passed to preferred phone 540 when mobile phone 230 is within range of transmitter 220 (Holloway – paragraph 20). Holloway, however, does not disclose or suggest forwarding calls intended for at least two communications devices to preferred phone 240/540 of Holloway in response to receipt of an indication that mobile phone 230 is within range of transmitter 220 and based on user-defined preferences, as would be required by amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Holloway does not disclose or suggest each of the features of amended claim 1.

The Applicants further assert that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Holloway to include the features discussed above. For

Application Serial No. 10/720,970  
Attorney Docket No. 03-1018

example, Holloway is clearly directed to forwarding calls intended for a single mobile phone 230 to a preferred phone when mobile phone 230 is within range of transmitter 220. Holloway does not suggest any desire or need to forward calls intended for multiple devices to a preferred phone in response to receipt of an indication that one of the devices is within wireless range of transmitter 220. That is, Holloway is clearly directed to a simple forwarding scheme in which calls from one phone are forwarded to another phone and is not related to managing calls directed to a plurality of communications devices. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to modify Holloway to include the features recited in amended claim 1 without the benefit of the applicants' disclosure.

Claims 2, 4-6 and 8-10 are dependent on claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 1 is allowable.<sup>2</sup> In addition, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by Holloway.

For example, claim 4, as amended, recites receiving a second indication that the first communications device has moved outside of wireless communication range of the terminal, terminating the forwarding of calls to the second communications device in response to receipt of the second indication and forwarding calls intended for at least two of the communications devices to the first communications device in response to receipt of the second indication. Holloway discloses that when mobile phone 230 moves out of range of transmitter 220, mobile phone 230 transmits a request to remove the forwarding request (Holloway – paragraph 17). Holloway does not disclose or suggest forwarding any calls intended for other communications devices to mobile phone 230, in response to

---

<sup>2</sup> As Applicant's remarks with respect to the basic independent claims are sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections of all claims dependent therefrom, Applicant's silence as to the Examiner's assertions with respect to dependent claims is not a concession by Applicant to the Examiner's assertions as to these claims, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions in the future.

Application Serial No. 10/720,970  
Attorney Docket No. 03-1018

receipt of a signal indicating that mobile phone 230 is outside of wireless communication range of transmitter 220, as would be required by amended claim 4.

For at least this additional reason, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 4 are respectfully requested.

Claim 11, as amended, recites features similar to, but of different scope than, claim 1. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Holloway does not disclose or suggest each of the features of amended claim 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 11 are respectfully requested.

Claims 12-16 and 18-20 are dependent on claim 11 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 11 is allowable. In addition, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by Holloway.

For example, claim 14 recites features similar to, but of different scope than, claim 4. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 4, Holloway does not disclose or suggest each of the features of amended claim 14. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 14 are respectfully requested.

Claim 16 recites that the user defined preferences include a preference indicating that calls intended for at least the third communications device and a fourth communications device are to be forwarded to the first communications device when the first communications device is not within wireless communication range of the second communications device. As discussed above, Holloway does not disclose storing user-defined preferences for a plurality of communications devices. Therefore, Holloway cannot disclose user defined preferences that relate to calls intended for a third communications device and a fourth communications device, much less that calls

Application Serial No. 10/720,970  
Attorney Docket No. 03-1018

intended for the third and fourth communications device are to be forwarded to the first communications device when the first communications device is not within wireless communication range of the second communications device, as recited in amended claim 16. In contrast, Holloway discloses that when mobile phone 230 is no longer within range of transmitter 220, mobile phone 230 sends a request message to cellular system 230 to remove the forwarding request (Holloway – paragraph 17). Holloway does not disclose or suggest that calls intended for preferred phone 240 and another device are forwarded to mobile phone 230 after mobile phone 230 is outside the range of transmitter 220, as would be required by claim 16.

For at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 16 are respectfully requested.

Claim 21, as amended, recites features similar to, but of different scope than, claims 1 and 4. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 4, Holloway does not disclose or suggest each of the features of amended claim 21. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 21 are respectfully requested.

Claim 22, as amended, also recites features similar to, but of different scope than, claim 1. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Holloway does not disclose or suggest each of the features of amended claim 22.

Claim 22, as amended, also recites forwarding calls intended for the third communications device to the first communications device when the indication indicates that the first communications device is not within range of the second communications device. Holloway does not disclose or suggest this feature. For example, Holloway

Application Serial No. 10/720,970  
Attorney Docket No. 03-1018

discloses that when mobile phone 230 is no longer within range of transmitter 220, mobile phone 230 sends a request message to cellular system 230 to remove the forwarding request (Holloway – paragraph 17). Holloway does not disclose or suggest that calls intended for preferred phone 240 are forwarded to mobile phone 230 after mobile phone 230 is outside the range of transmitter 220, as would be required by claim 22.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Holloway does not disclose or suggest each of the features of amended claim 22. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 22 are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

Application Serial No. 10/720,970  
Attorney Docket No. 03-1018

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-2347 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Joseph R. Palmieri  
Reg. No. 40,760

Date: May 3, 2006

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.  
c/o Christian R. Andersen  
600 Hidden Ridge Drive  
Mail Code HQE03H14  
Irving, Texas 75038  
(972) 718-4800  
**CUSTOMER NUMBER 32127**

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent Office at 571-273-8300.

Dated: May 3, 2006

Signature:   
(Christian R. Andersen)